	DOC SECTION PAGE NO.	QUESTION/COMMENT	RESPONSE
1.	Page 3 Appendices	In the pre-submittal meeting, a reference was made to a 2017 market study that was available upon request. I see a presentation slide deck in Appendix 4 labeled "market update".  Is there is a more comprehensive report that you can provide?	In addition to the slide deck which has been posted on the City's website, we are also including a link to a presentation given at the July 20, 2017 City Council meeting at which a summary of the market analysis was provided.  The Market Analysis summary starts at 20:11 of the video. <a href="http://cedarparktx.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=8&amp;clip_id=1286&amp;meta_id=33785">http://cedarparktx.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=8&amp;clip_id=1286&amp;meta_id=33785</a>
2.	General BidNet	Is there a bid qualification packet you are sending out?	The solicitation type for the above project is a Request for Qualification (RFQ) rather than a bid thus it will not have an associated bid package per se. The information associated with this RFQ has been posted along with other supporting documents on BidNet.  Addendum #1 issued on Friday, June 1, 2018 and the Pre-Submittal Workshop materials (from May 30th) have been posted onto the BidNet site.
3.	Page 18 Section 4. Evaluation Process and Criteria 4.2 Pass/Fail Review	Do you have a comprehensive list of the commitments mentioned in the 4.2 Pass/Fail rubric under letter (f)?	Attachment A Response Letter to RFQ No. 05-026-218-DV-150 and Attachment B Respondent's Questionnaire for RFQ No. 05-025-218-DV-150 to the extent applicable form the basis of the commitments described under Subsection 4.2 letter (f).

4.	Page 15, Section 3. Statement of Qualifications Content and Submittal Requirements 3.2 Format	Can attachment A+B be included as appendices after the 60-page limit?	No, both Attachment A & Attachment B should be included and numbered as part of the 60-page count.  Further, as noted in the following paragraph "Standard corporate brochures, awards, licenses and marketing materials shall not be included in a SOQ."
5.	Page 18, Section 4. Evaluation Process and Criteria 4.3 Qualifications Evaluation Criteria and Weighting	As mentioned in the grading rubric under 4.3, should we be including examples of previous design and project documentation, budgets, CA communication? Does this extend the 60 page limit?	Your Statement of Qualifications should go into sufficient detail as to describe the firm/teams relevant background and experience. The format of how that information is to be illustrated is not being prescribed. The content should be included as part of the 60-page count.
6.	Page 1 of 35 2 <sup>nd</sup> Paragraph and Page 13 of 35 Section 2.5	Two instances were found within the RFQ where RFQ NO. 50-026-218-DV-150 was sited. Is this in error?	Yes, please note that the correct number is RFQ NO. 05-026-218-DV-150.

7.	Page 7 Section 1.3 Opportunity Ensuring A Mix of Land Uses	RE: Mix of Land Uses: Does the City have an existing list of needs relevant to a possible "civic use"? Would the City directly fund the construction of such use?	The City will be undergoing an exercise geared to identifying the city's needs and wants at our Council's Retreat this summer. These will then be incorporated into the Request for Proposals and eventually negotiated as part of the agreement including determining the responsible party as it pertains to funding. There have been several concepts considered for a possible civic use such as a Library or Performing Arts Center. No decisions have been made regarding the civic use, and whether or not it will be part of the development. Decisions related to funding capital cost are also undetermined at this time.
8.	General	Is the city's intention to sell the land fee simple to the developer or a combination of fee simple and ground lease as a way to improve the economics of a proposed project?	The City has not yet made any decisions but is open to all reasonable options.
9.	General	Can you provide details on any access rights held by the owners of the unsold parcels or obligations from the city and future developer to the parcel owners? How would the city like to incorporate these sites in the development process?	The City is required to ensure that the unsold properties have access for ingress and egress. The Master Developer is encouraged to acquire additional parcels for this phase or later phases depending on compatibility with the Master Developer's concept.

10.	General	What will be the process and timing to plat new blocks, streets, and vacate any easements, etc.?	As noted above, the City does anticipate asking those shortlisted to provide us with their approach to how they would proceed with staging the various phases. See response to Question 7 above regarding the planned upcoming exercise that will determine the "needs and wants" that ultimately are to be negotiated.
11.	General	Is the extension of Park West drive still a priority without the city's ownership of the land bordering the proposed roadway?	The City has not yet assigned any prioritization to the supporting infrastructure. The City anticipates working with the Master Developer jointly to develop a strategic implementation plan.
12.	Exhibit 2: Bell Boulevard Realignment Project	Is the proposed TXDOT schematic showing a cul-de-sac servicing the existing retail a temporary public ROW?	Yes.
13.	General	Does the city have any plans to address the fuel pumps located at 111 Bell Blvd.?	The City has entered into a Lease-Back Agreement with the former Property Owner with plans to reassess and revisit prior to the end of their term. If deemed appropriate, the City would include the Master Developer in future discussions pertaining to how best to properly abandon these tanks.
14.	General	The 5.21 acre site at 107 Bell Blvd. adjacent to the Austin Car Wash (111 Bell Blvd.) is also owned by the same person as Austin Car Wash. Any reason that parcel has not reached a purchase and sale agreement? This site borders the extension of Park West Drive.	It is the City's understanding that the property located at 107 S Bell Blvd is under contract with another buyer. Should the property become available, the City will consider purchasing it.

15.	Page 12 Section 2.1 Overall Process	Under 2.1 Process, the process describes the intent to create the RFP after "industry review". Could you elaborate on that means? Will the RFP evaluation criteria be materially different than the SOQ evaluation criteria?	The Request for Proposals (RFP) is under development now. The intent of the Industry Review is to provide an opportunity for Shortlisted Proposers to review the draft RFP and provide the CITY with any comments before the issuance of the RFP. The City will take these comments into consideration and will make the final determination to include or not to include.  Yes, the RFP evaluation criterion will be materially different than the SOQ evaluation criteria given that we will be evaluating on approach to how the project will be financed as well as how it will be developed.
16.	Page 18 Section 4 Evaluation Process and Criteria Section 4.2 Pass/Fail Review and Section 4.3 Qualifications Evaluation Criteria and Weighting	Sections 4.2 & 4.3 have language about bonding and construction capacity. In that a developer may not have in-house construction services do you agree that criteria may not be relevant to the SOQ?	We do believe this is relevant criteria.  The City is looking for an experienced Master Developer with a proven track record, although the City does recognize that this may be the first time members have partnered together.  At this stage, Section 4.2 is merely seeking an acknowledgment that a member/members of the Respondent's team does have the capacity to carry out all development responsibilities while in Section 4.3 seeks a description of relevant applicable experience.